

Executive Registry

64-474

17 January 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR : Deputy Director, Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Inspector General's Survey of Cable Secretariat

1. Your memorandum dated 27 December 1963, subject as above, asked that I furnish in 30 days a summary of action taken or comments on the recommendations made by the IG in his December 1963 survey of the Cable Secretariat.

2. First, let me say that I am proud indeed to be a part of an office about which the Inspector General can say: "The Cable Secretariat has met its mission so successfully that our recommendations are peripheral to its primary function."

3. I believe that the survey was thorough, objective, and well-conducted. With the exception of recommendation number six, I concur in each recommendation made and have taken positive action along the lines recommended for each recommendation directed to me. With reference to recommendation number six, concerning the elimination of individual production reports, I am not at this time in agreement with the Inspector General's views on the premise that the production reports are of considerable value to me in my management of the Cable Secretariat.

4. My comments upon each of the recommendations, a statement of action taken, and my comments on certain other portions of the report are contained in the enclosure. STAT



Cable Secretary

Enclosure: Comments on IG Survey

744 51 1 11 24

MORI/CDF

filed IG Survey

SECRET

**CABLE SECRETARY COMMENTS ON THE INSPECTOR GENERAL'S
SURVEY OF CABLE SECRETARIAT - December 1963**

1.a. Recommendation No. 1

"The Deputy Director (Support) provide for the amendment of to include provisions outlining the missions and functions of the Cable Secretariat."

25X1

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

No comments and no action required on the part of the Cable Secretary.

2.a. Recommendation No. 2

"The Cable Secretary seek expert technical assistance through the Deputy Director (Support) in surveying the steps that can be taken to improve the physical working conditions and atmosphere of the Cable Secretariat Message Center."

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

- (1) As indicated in the survey, we have for some time been aware that the physical working conditions and atmosphere of the Cable Secretariat could be improved. The pneumatic tubes and a blower motor, which upon installation had been left open, were a source of considerable noise. We have had these enclosed with sound proofing material.
- (2) The flexowriters are another source of noise. We have located a stand for one of these machines and are in the process of buying or having made Acoustinets to cover the machine.
- (3) With reference to background music, we priced in mid-1962 an AM/FM tuner with 12 speakers which would provide music at the proper points and proper sound levels. The price installed was approximated at \$815 plus installation. We would like the equipment. We don't have the money.
- (4) As to atmosphere, we need to have our area cleaned more frequently than the schedule now provides, i.e., every 13 weeks. Arrangements have been made with the Chief, Logistics Service Division,

to provide this improved service and to charge it to the Cable Secretariat. On September 18, 1963, [redacted] inspected the Cable Secretariat and at that time [redacted] indicated that portions of the Cable Secretariat should be covered with vinyl plastic wall covering and perhaps additional acoustical tile be installed. I anticipate that this will be done, unless the funds are tied up. Cable Secretariat does not have funds for this.

25X1

- (5) As to partitions and other steps which might be taken, including painting and vinyl wall covering to make the Cable Secretariat a better place in which to work, on 9 January 1964 I asked the DDS to furnish the technical assistance and the funds to improve the physical working conditions and atmosphere of the Cable Secretariat. Our actions will of necessity, be dependent upon the availability of funds.

3.a. Recommendation No. 3

"The Cable Secretary seek the assistance of the Office of Personnel in establishing that certain typists have supervisory duties in relation to other typists, with the intent of upgrading those positions to the extent that their additional responsibility justifies it."

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

At the time the present T/O was set up, in the interest of economy and because we felt we did not need a chief typist, we did not ask for such a position. We have asked the Salary and Wage people to review a new job sheet for Chief, Typing and Logging Section. The tentative outlook is that the job will be approved at a GS-6, and that we can make effective use of the person in that job and at that salary. Should the GS-6 grade be approved, selection of the person to fill it will be based on our best judgment as to the persons most qualified to do the job.

4.a. Recommendation No. 4

"The Executive Director appoint a special working group composed of representatives of the Deputy Directors to explore the establishment of a centralized CIA Watch Office."

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

No comment other than that some consolidation may be feasible. No action required on the part of the Cable Secretary at this time.

5.a. Recommendation No. 5

"The Cable Secretary request the Salary and Wage Division of the Office of Personnel to conduct a full review of staffing of the Cable Secretariat to determine its adequacy; that the findings with appropriate recommendations be reported to the Executive Director/Comptroller; that this study be undertaken no later than January 1965."

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

I have submitted to the Salary and Wage Division of the Office of Personnel a request that they conduct such a study in November-December 1964 and that they submit their findings to me in such time that I may comment and forward them to the Executive Director/Comptroller not later than 1 January 1965.

6.a. Recommendation No. 6

"The Cable Secretary, on a trial basis, eliminate individual production statistics as a regular part of Cable Secretariat administration, and that production figures be maintained on a shift and office basis during the trial period to determine what effect, if any, there is on over-all production; that if production is not affected adversely, these individual production statistics be discontinued permanently, to be used in the future on only a spot check basis."

b. Non-concur

c. Comments and action taken:

I will concede that the production statistics of individual performance may not have the same degree of validity as the overall figures, and that the figures are subject to manipulation in a variety of ways (here I presume manipulation to be applicable to other than the use I make of the figures). However, I do not believe that these figures are of dubious reliability. As a manager I must use all means available to me to accomplish my job, and these figures, though they may be less than precise, are still reliable and usable figures. The trend today is toward more and more work measurement in the office and clerical worker jobs. I believe that it is important that I know what the production rates are for each person. I can and do make allowances for variances among shifts. By compiling figures for months, I believe I purge the statistics quite thoroughly of any taint which might be applied to a short-run compilation. The fact

that an analyst can do more OUT cables than IN cables is conceded. OUT cables represent but one type. In addition there are long and short cables, complex and simple cables, State Dept, Navy, Army, Air, AID, USIA, CIA, JCS--a baker's dozen. But over a period of months, an analyst's production is not affected unduly by the various types of cables and his output can be measured fairly accurately and is comparable to the output of others. These figures, though not the sole basis for consideration, do serve as one valuable means of measuring a person's ability and reflect in considerable degree his work attitude. For example, some analysts with several years of experience have a rate of production but a fraction of that of analysts with little more than a year of experience. Knowing the people, and with records over a period of many months, it seems indisputable that the low-producing analyst is not as deserving of promotion nor worth as much to the Agency as the higher producing analyst. Without records, and based on observation alone, I would have some difficulty arriving at and supporting this same conclusion. There is a tendency to allow the "halo effect" to influence ones evaluation of a person who is attractive, has a pleasant personality, is congenial, and all in all is a very friendly type of person. But simply because a person is a "good Joe" is not sufficient reason to rate him above another person who can, and does, out-produce him significantly under comparable conditions and on the same type of work. The same is true of the offset press operators. Over a period of months they tend to get the same number of single and multiple page cables to run. In any event, I base my evaluation of their productivity primarily on the number of mats run. The number of impressions run over a long period will average out. I am the primary evaluator of these production figures. I know what they mean and what they are worth. I use them, aware of their relative good and bad points. I am training my supervisors to make use of these same figures, and I believe I am making progress. But to discontinue individual production reports temporarily or permanently because they are less than precise or because they are not accepted by some workers, would be to deprive me of a valuable tool. I have arrived at my position of non-currence reluctantly and only after much soul searching. It is difficult to determine at what point a conviction firmly held has given way to stubbornness and an inability to admit to a mistake. I firmly believe, however, that I need the production reports and that I make good use of them, even though they may not be accepted by the workers. If the reports are a factor tending to cause unrest, it obviously seems in my interest to discontinue the reports. Certainly that would be the easier and more popular course of action. Should I do so, however, I believe I would be acting against my better judgment. Production reports of almost any nature are seldom popular, and they are often assailed as being inaccurate, time-consuming, mis-used, unused,

misinterpreted and just down right useless. To those who do not believe in figures and who would substitute opinion or observation for documentary evidence, figures may serve as an irritant and seem to be of no use. For my part, I prefer to use figures to assist me in arriving at a conclusion which I can defend with something other than unsupportable and thus easily contested opinion. To the low producer, the figures may be the bane of his existence; to the high producer, the figures may be the means of achieving recognition, and I am impressed with high production. I don't deny it. But high production alone is not the criterion used for advancement. When it is accompanied by a low error count, good attendance, good work habits and attitude, we have a situation in which an individual should be recognized, and in which we are getting the best return for our investment. In any event, our production figures are not an end in themselves; they are simply one of several factors used in the management of the office. I will try to improve the accuracy of the figures, I will try to devise a way of getting figures less susceptible to manipulation, and I will try to make clear my use and evaluation of these figures to all concerned. However, I don't expect to get 100% acceptance of the need for these or any production figures because to my knowledge there has never been 100% acceptance of any method of measuring man's ability. When and if I believe the individual production figures are of no further use, or if I can be shown that they are not sufficiently accurate to be usable, I will discontinue their use immediately.

7.a. Recommendation No. 7

"The Cable Secretary review personnel management procedures to ensure that he and key supervisors have a reasonable awareness of the attitudes and problems of individual Secretariat employees which might be indicative of potential security vulnerabilities."

b. Concur

c. Comments and action taken:

While I concur in the recommendation itself, I do question the implication that I do not have a "...reasonable awareness of the attitudes and problems of individual Secretariat employees." I believe that my top staff, i.e., myself, [redacted] know as much about Cable Secretariat people as any comparable staff in any like position. To the point, however, I know full well the intent of the IG's recommendation and I am well aware of the need to do even better than we have done. To this end, we have arranged for [redacted]

25X1

25X1

25X1

Office of Security, to hold a round-table discussion with all Cable Secretariat supervisors. My objective is to bring to the supervisors first hand guidance as to what to look for, and what to do about what they see which might indicate a potential security problem. In a conglomerate group such as the Cable Secretariat, we may well fall short of the ideal supervisor/employee relationship. I shall do everything in my power to see that my supervisors and I know our people. I too believe that this is essential.

8. General comments, apart from comments on specific recommendations:

a. A major problem has been to develop competent leadership for the Message Center. Fate and our grade structure--and perhaps some lack of competence on my part--have resulted in the creation of a number of problems in our Message Center supervision. Almost without exception, the present supervisors lack prior supervisory experience. They are not "natural" leaders. They have tended to refer their problems to the front office in order that the solutions, which are on occasion not too popular, may be charged to others than themselves. Often they don't see a pending problem until it is past the easy solution stage. However, they have many good qualities, and I hope they will, in most if not all cases, grow into competent supervisors. They have all attended the Basic Supervision Course except one and he is scheduled to attend in March.

b. With reference to personnel management, the IG report states on page 24: "While we feel that Secretariat management relied too heavily upon the A&E judgment, rather than using it as only "one datum" in its decision as the A&E Staff believed it should be used...." As the person responsible for the use of the A&E assessment, I believe that there is some misunderstanding on the part of the IG officer as to how the A&E assessment is used. I can and I do assure you that the A&E assessment, though important, is but one of several factors considered in evaluating a person. I believe the A&E Staff understands and concurs in this use of their evaluation. I consider all recommendations, statistics, evaluations, and comments when selecting a person for advancement, but I don't let them serve as a substitute for my best judgment. This is sometimes not understood by persons passed over, though I have explained it in advance as policy and in several instances after the fact as policy implemented. It seems inevitable that in selecting the most qualified person for advancement one must expect to incur the displeasure of those with seniority who are passed over. I believe this is a price which we must pay and is preferable to falling back on the old seniority rule wherein promotions are effected with too little regard for ability and potential.

c. The IG on page 25 of the report stated: "The concurrent concentration of the Cable Secretariat and his senior assistants on office administrative detail resulted in a real gap in personnel management in the Secretariat... We feel this to be sufficiently important that the Cable Secretary should free himself from

much of the detailed review of cables now carried on by him in order to devote more time to assuring himself that the Message Center Chiefs become more than production foremen, and to make his presence and positive personality better known to those who work in his organization." This is a big order. The Cable Secretariat is a production shop, and it seems not illogical to consider the supervisors in great part production foremen. Certainly to accomplish the Cable Secretariat mission, the supervisors must be very production-minded. As to how I can make my "...presence and positive personality better known..."--- this too is a big job. Without injecting myself more than I do now into a group concerned with a facet of production, e.g., logging, typing, analyzing, assembling, slotting, making master copies, I am at a loss as to how I can accomplish this. I would like to think that the Message Center Chiefs could carry my image to the people. Possibly this is expecting too much. In any event, I shall do my best to get with my people more and to free myself from some of the "detailed review of cables". I would like to state for the record, however, that in my opinion, no little part of my ability to do my job has derived from my reviewing cables, which has never consumed more than half of my time. My position is unique in this regard since I probably read or scan more cables than any other person in the Agency. This has been invaluable to me in recognizing the need for new requirements, new dissemination patterns, and a variety of other problems relating to cable processing. The IG's position may be well taken, however, that I should spend more time with my people. It won't be easy, because ours is not an easy-going office where there is time to socialize to any extent.

d. As a last comment--I am appreciative of the effort on the part of the IG to spot those areas of Cable Secretariat operations needing my attention. I shall attempt conscientiously to make the Cable Secretariat a better place in which to work while at the same time managing its operation in such a manner that our "customers" get the best in service.